

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Response:

Claims 3-6 have been amended to correct the indefinite claim language present in the original claims. Reconsideration of claims 3-6 is therefore respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Paltieli (US 5,647,373).

Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish from Paltieli. Claim 1 recites that a pedestal comprises a housing, and that a pulse ultrasound probe installed in front of the housing for emitting a pulse ultrasonic signal toward the examinee along the direction of the housing. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite that a propeller moves the pedestal along a direction parallel with the direction of the pulse ultrasonic signals for moving a syringe along the direction of the pulse ultrasonic signals.

Paltieli teaches an ultrasound imaging machine for guiding a needle. However, Paltieli does not teach that a motor moves the needle in a direction parallel with the signals output by the ultrasound transducer 4. This is apparent from viewing Figures

3 and 6 of Paltieli, which show the needle entering the body at an angle different from the signals output by the ultrasound transducer 4.

5 Since Paltieli does not teach inserting the needle in a direction parallel to the signals output by the ultrasound transducer, there is a chance that the needle will be inserted at the wrong angle or location. Therefore, the claimed invention avoids these problems by having the propeller move the pedestal and the syringe along a direction parallel with the direction of the pulse ultrasonic signals.

10 For these reasons, the currently amended claim 1 is patentable over Paltieli. Furthermore, claims 2-3 and 6 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-3 and 6 is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

15 Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paltieli in view of Akhavi (US 4,317,455).

Response:

20 As to claim 4, neither Paltieli nor Akhavi teach a housing have an aperture for containing a clipper inside an inner wall of the housing. Therefore, the combination of Paltieli and Akhavi also does not teach a cover covering a front end of the housing and an inner wall of the housing. Instead, Akhavi only teaches in Figure 2 a cover 15 for covering a front end of the housing, but not for covering an inner wall of the housing. For these reasons, claims 4 and 5 are patentable over the cited prior art.

25 Furthermore, claims 4 and 5 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/708,397
Amdt. dated March 14, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 05, 2007

In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

5 Sincerely yours,



Date: 03/14/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

10 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.
15 is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)